

Date: Thu, 28 Jan 93 21:29:20 PST  
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V93 #129  
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest                      Thu, 28 Jan 93                      Volume 93 : Issue 129

Today's Topics:

                    CQ EU de AH1A  
                    Endurance (2 msgs)  
          Help! Voyager transmits at 146.52 MHz!  
          I love/hate Wayne Green! (2 msgs)  
                    LICENSE DELAYS  
                    No-codes  
  Re: writing out -- --- .-. ... . in order to pass your exam  
                    Real NoCodes  
                    Retuning Commercial Gear  
          Using electrical outlet ground as earth ground?????

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----  
Date: Thu, 28 Jan 1993 12:34:24 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!spool.mu.edu!uwm.edu!linac!att!  
cbnewsk!cbnewsj!k2ph@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: CQ EU de AH1A  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

-----  
Date: Wed, 27 Jan 1993 20:11:31 GMT  
From: agate!spool.mu.edu!uwm.edu!cs.utexas.edu!sdd.hp.com!hpscit.sc.hp.com!  
hplextra!hpfcs!hpfcmgw!perry@ames.arpa

Subject: Endurance  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Re: "Endurance", QST, Feb 1993

I enjoy Joe's humor more than his science fiction.

Perry Scott  
AA0ET

-----  
Date: 28 Jan 93 15:25:31 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!spool.mu.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!  
zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!rphroy!link.ph.gmr.com!vbreault@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Endurance  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <19530066@hpfcmgw.FC.HP.COM> perry@hpfcmgw.FC.HP.COM (Perry Scott)  
writes:

Re: "Endurance", QST, Feb 1993

I enjoy Joe's humor more than his science fiction.

Joe is indeed a very funny man. I've saved several of his posts  
and re-read them from time to time.

Keep it up Joe.

--  
-val-

Val Breault - GM Research - vbreault@gmr.com - N80EF  
Instrumentation dept., 30500 Mound Rd., Warren, MI 48090-9055  
The opinions expressed by the author do not necessarily reflect  
those of GMR or those of the General Motors Corporation.

\\ /|  
\\ / |  
\\ /\_\_|  
\\ / |\_\_

-----  
Date: Wed, 27 Jan 1993 16:24:10 GMT  
From: munnari.oz.au!spool.mu.edu!agate!iat.holonet.net!psinntp!psinntp!gdstech!  
gdstech!bat@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Help! Voyager transmits at 146.52 MHz!  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Some guys have found that the new car radios, not just the computers,

are throwing out hash. Much of it goes into the DC supply. Radios have 2 DC lines, one always on to keep the memory and clock hot, the other to run the radio. This line is switched by the ignition key. Radio Shack now sells a 2 line filter for car DC lines. It might work. To find out, just disconnect the 2 radio lines while you hear the hash, and see if it goes away. I havent heard of anyone who has yet cured car computer noise. I wish I did.

--

```
*-----*
*   Pat Masterson           | KE2LJ@KC2FD           *
*   Grumman Data Systems    | 516-346-6316.        *
*   M/S D12-25              |                      *
*-----*
```

-----

Date: Thu, 28 Jan 1993 15:15:25 GMT  
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!sdd.hp.com!cs.utexas.edu!  
hermes.chpc.utexas.edu!news.utdallas.edu!corpgate!brtph560!brtph87!  
tcain@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: I love/hate Wayne Green!  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jan27.192114.3004@cbnewsm.cb.att.com> jeffj@cbnewsm.cb.att.com  
(jeffrey.n.jones) writes:  
>As soon as I get my new issue of 73 magazine I sit down and open it  
>up to Wayne Green's editorial! I always enjoy reading what he has to  
>say and even if I don't agree with him it makes for a good read. Wayne  
I agree wholeheartedly!! I enjoy all of 73, but, Wayne's editorial is  
what makes the mag unique and always the first thing I read. Amateur  
radio NEEDS a rabble-rouser and Wayne does a great job at it!

-----

Date: Thu, 28 Jan 1993 15:16:30 GMT  
From: pacbell.com!sgiblab!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!news.acns.nwu.edu!  
usenet@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: I love/hate Wayne Green!  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jan27.204709.5314@nntpd.lkg.dec.com>  
j\_otterson@otters.enet.dec.com (Jeff Otterson/N1KDO) writes:  
>  
>I think Wayne Green should have been Ross Perot's running mate. B-)  
>  
>But seriously, I \*do\* like 73 mag...  
>  
I missed the earlier post on WG, so I may be repeating:

What a waste. Four or five pages of 8 point font with not a picture or diagram to break the monotony (or should I say monologue.) Even with the usual translation of a thousand words per picture, I bet his editorial is by far the biggest piece in the magazine.

I still get it because I like the HR articles more than I dislike paying for his diatribe.

Rajiv  
aa9ch  
r-dewan@nwu.edu

-----  
Date: 27 Jan 93 13:11:36 EST  
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!agate!iat.holonet.net!psinntp!  
psinntp!arrl.org@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: LICENSE DELAYS  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.misc, plaws@uafhp.uark.edu (Peter Laws) writes:

>  
> Same in these parts (NW Ark.). Novice 5-6 weeks, Tech 8-10-12 weeks.  
>  
> Now, is it the League (ARRL VEC in this area) holding them up on  
>purpose, or does the FCC have a "quota" system?  
>  
> I \*have\* noticed that the League has trouble dealing with the Tech  
>explosion, ie. a statement in the latest Handbook (or was it a mailer?)  
>commenting on the recent jump in numbers of new hams and how it \*may\*, MAY  
>be due to the new codeless ticket.  
>  
> Sheesh. What do we have to do? Beat them over the head with a key?  
>  
>  
>(PS- Yes I pay my dues, and Yes, overall the League does a good job.  
>Especially the new booklet they mail to new hams--Excellent!)

Peter, thanks for your support of the organization. As to how long licenses are taking, and the time required for VE Teams and the VECs to process the test sessions; and the mailing times between the VEs and the VEC as well as between the VEC and the FCC; if the test sessions were ARRL/VEC-coordinated we can determine exactly how long each step took. On average, seven to ten extra days are introduced with VE Team and VEC processing. Typically, sessions are processed through the ARRL/VEC in five days. If you want to share the test dates and locations with me, more can be determined about the time requirements for each step in the process. The FCC is a FIFO operation (first in,

first out {aside from some internal shuffling on their end}). Class of license would have no effect.

73,

Bart J. Jahnke, KB9NM  
Manager  
ARRL/VEC.

-----  
Date: 28 Jan 1993 17:14:45 GMT  
From: munnari.oz.au!spool.mu.edu!darwin.sura.net!mojo.eng.umd.edu!  
chuck@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: No-codes  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <14570603@hpnmdla.sr.hp.com> alanb@hpnmdla.sr.hp.com (Alan Bloom) writes:

>In rec.radio.amateur.misc, mellob@cary115.its.rpi.edu (Elmer Fudd) writes:

>

>> It's understandable that no-code technicians would be aggravated

>> by being designated as such. This is why I refer to a no-code

>> tech as simply a "Technician." And refer to a Technician as a

>> "Technician Plus HF" or simply a "Tech Plus."

>

>So how would you translate this sentence into Politically Correct language?

>

> "No-code Technicians may not transmit on the 10 meter band."

>

Easy!

"A Technician may not transmit on the 10 meter band."

"A Technician Plus may transmit in the Technician Plus segment of the  
10 meter band."

or similarly,

"A General may not transmit in the Advanced Class segments."

73,

Chuck Harris - WA3UQV

-----  
Date: Wed, 27 Jan 1993 19:45:04 GMT  
From: agate!spool.mu.edu!uwm.edu!cs.utexas.edu!sdd.hp.com!hpsc.it.sc.hp.com!

hplextra!hpfcso!hpfcmgw!perry@ames.arpa

Subject: Re: writing out -- --- .-. ... . in order to pass your exam

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

>Subject: Re: writing out -- --- .-. ... . in order to pass your exam

>

>>The rules only require the examinee to demonstrate the ability to send  
>>and receive text in Morse Code. Intermediate forms are not of interest.  
>>In the one VE session I worked, one examinee copied in Sanskrit. It was  
>>accepted by the rest of the team. We only care about 7 of 10 questions  
>>or one minute of copy.

>>

>>Perry Scott

>>AA0ET

>

>So what are you saying... that if one of your testees turns in a blank  
>question sheet and a form with all dots and dashes you give credit for  
>"one minute of copy"?

>

>Seems to me you have to either accept the dots and dashes as copy or  
>you don't.

>

>Dube Todd                    AB5AP                    <dube@cpdvax.csc.ti.com>

"...send and receive text in Morse Code." I think that implies the  
ability to translate, don't you? The exam sheet in question had the  
Sanskrit, with characters written below. There were 25 good characters,  
so it's a "pass".

Perry

-----

Date: Thu, 28 Jan 1993 13:08:05 GMT

From: rocksanne!kzin!hdavies@cs.rochester.edu

Subject: Real NoCodes

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

It seems that radio amateurs are not only divided by their knowledge  
of Morse Code.

They are also divided by their possession (or not) of a sense of humour.

But given how socially dysfunctional many of them (us) are, I'm not at  
all surprised.

---

Regards,

Hugh, G0CNR.

-----  
I don't speak for Xerox. | It's no use being clever - we are all  
Rank Xerox Centre, UK. | clever here; just try to be kind - a  
Huge.wgc1@rx.xerox.com | little kind. (F.J. Foakes Jackson)  
-----

Date: Thu, 28 Jan 93 15:42:56 GMT

From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!sdd.hp.com!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!

orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!atlas.la.locus.com!dana@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: Retuning Commercial Gear

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <8937@orbit.cts.com> rambler@pnet51.orb.mn.org (Dan Meyer) writes:

>mark@ERA.COM (Mark Feit) writes:

>>Has anyone seen books (doubtful) or files in an archive (more  
>>probable) on using commercial gear in the ham bands?

>>

>>Lately I've been toying with the idea of finding some old commercial  
>>gear to retune and use on the 2m and 70cm bands. Mostly I'm looking  
>>for handhelds and low-power mobiles (10-20 watts) to have around the  
>>house and in the office. Bells and whistles aren't necessary; just  
>>something with two or four channels that can be set up to use on  
>>repeaters or for simplex if necessary. PL encode/decode would be  
>>nice, but isn't a must.

>>

Most commercial mobile radios use helical resonators in the front  
end, and the resonators have a limited tuning range. For example,  
Micors come in 138-150 and 150-174 Mhz variants. You'd prefer the  
138-150 Mhz "split". I've successfully tuned a 150-174 MHz GE Custom  
MVP down to 145 Mhz, but it was close. I know folks that have moved  
450-470 Mhz mobiles down to 440 Mhz, too.

Some mobile radios have highly tuned circuits at the transmitter  
output, such as a mobile duplexer or isolator. These can make retuning  
a radio difficult. Your common swap-meet radio will probably not have  
these items.

>

>My wife and I use some regency UHF synthesized mobile rigs in our cars.

>

>I had no trouble at all retuning them for use in the 440 repeater band.

>

>the sensitvity is a little less than a "real" ham rig, but they do  
>meet regency specs. ( .5uV for 10 db sinad ). they do have a 20  
>watt power output, 10 channels, and work just like they disigned to work.

"real" ham rigs usually favor sensitivity over intermodulation and  
desense rejection. Most commercial radios have 4 or 5 sections of  
helical resonator before the mixer/RF amp. They're very hard to  
desense with in-band signals, and nearly impossible to desense with  
out-band signals. True, they are a little less sensitive, but if you  
live in an RF dense area, they work better. If you live in an  
RF sparse area, use a GaAsFET pre-amp.

--

\* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are \*  
\* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily \*  
\* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer  
\*  
\* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests \*

-----  
Date: Wed, 27 Jan 1993 20:36:21 GMT  
From: agate!spool.mu.edu!sdd.hp.com!hpscit.sc.hp.com!hplextra!hpfcso!hpfcmgw!  
perry@ames.arpa  
Subject: Using electrical outlet ground as earth ground?????  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

>Does the ground socket of an electrical outlet provide a good (or at  
>least reasonable) path to earth ground? I.e. would I be able to hook  
>up a three prong grounded plug with the two hot prongs removed in  
>order to connect my rig to earth ground via the electrical outlet?  
>  
> Patrick M. Stickler OH2LUV, KC4YYY

The ground on an outlet goes through a very long wire (aka antenna) back  
to the service entrance, where it then goes to earth ground. The ground  
wire must be close to a multiple of a quarter wavelength (N=0 is the  
happiest). If the ground wire is close to an odd multiple of a quarter  
wavelength, it will function as an antenna, rather than as RF ground.

One other problem with using house wiring is that the ground wire will  
radiate RF as current flows through it. Since the ground wire is in  
close proximity to the hot and neutral wires, your entire house will  
have RF/TVI problems.

There have been numerous articles in this group on obtaining a Real  
Ground (tm) - the Holy Grail of Hamdom. I saved a few of the more



entertaining ones.

Perry Scott  
AA0ET  
perry@fc.hp.com

-----  
Date: (null)  
From: (null)  
Does Luigi, AH1A, from Framingham, Massachusetts know that they're  
using his call? :-)

Just curious.

--  
-----  
Bob Schreibmaier K2PH | UUCP: ...!att!mtdcr!k2ph  
AT&T Bell Laboratories | Internet: k2ph@mtdcr.att.com  
Middletown, N.J. 07748 | ICBM: 40o21'N, 74o8'W  
-----

Date: 28 Jan 93 14:06:54 GMT  
From: pacbell.com!sgiblab!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!moe.ksu.ksu.edu!cis.ksu.edu!  
mac@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jan27.192114.3004@cbnewsm.cb.att.com>,  
<1993Jan27.204709.5314@nnnpd.lkg.dec.com>, <1k7fleINN3va@bashful.isi.com>  
Subject : Re: I love/hate Wayne Green!

jerry@isi.com (Jerry Gardner) writes:  
<In article <1993Jan27.204709.5314@nnnpd.lkg.dec.com> j\_otterson@star.enet.dec.com  
writes:  
<<I think Wayne Green should have been Ross Perot's running mate. B-)

<Wayne Green \*did\* run for president or vice president in one of the recent  
<presidential elections (1984 or 1988). The newspaper article I read this  
<in claimed Green wasn't a legal candidate because he is a convicted felon  
<(tax evasion, I think).

Why not just ask him? His email address is

70310.775@Compuserve.com

--Myron.

--

# We preserve our freedoms using four boxes: soap, ballot, jury, and cartridge.  
# Myron A. Calhoun, PhD EE; Assoc. Professor (913) 539-4448 home  
# INTERNET: mac@cis.ksu.edu (129.130.10.5) 532-6350 work, 532-7353 fax  
# UUCP: ...rutgers!depot!mac Packet-BBS: W0PBV @ KOVAY.#NEKS.KS.USA.NAOM

-----  
Date: 28 Jan 93 11:52:00 GMT  
From: agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!gatech!ukma!cs.widener.edu!dsinc!ub!  
acsu.buffalo.edu!ubvmsb.cc.buffalo.edu!oopdavid@ames.arpa  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <shl3cza@rpi.edu>, <C1F8Fp.4wM@inews.Intel.COM>,  
<44051@zygot.ati.com>er  
Subject : Re: Ham Radio Causes Cancer

In article <44051@zygot.ati.com>, john@zygot.ati.com (John Higdon) writes...  
>In article <C1F8Fp.4wM@inews.Intel.COM> jreece@sousa.intel.com writes:  
>  
>>There have been a number of "reports" on the major TV news magazines and  
>>tabloid shows about electromagnetic fields in general, and RF in particular,  
>>causing cancer.

Your comment is typical of an uninformed (and likely uneducated) bias about this subject. It is my contention that epidemiological studies to date, often quoted in the media, mention a link between exposure to electromagnetic fields and various cancers. Basic research has evaluated the mechanisms whereby such fields "promote" cancer. This is a topic that should be considered by all as an important one, not apparently something to ignore. Would you say that smoking does not cause cancer because you never saw anyone die under laboratory conditions and ruled out all other causes? Get real. There is more to life and biological systems than even the most learned in our scientific community can explain.

It's hard to say how much there is in it, given how  
>>the media loves to peddle health and safety scares.  
>

>Given that there are absolutely no studies making a scientific link  
>between RF and cancer, it is safe to say that until there is real  
>evidence to the contrary, there is NOTHING in it.  
>

>Please remember that this latest hoohah is the result of a lawsuit  
>against NEC and GTE Mobilnet blaming a cellular phone for the death of  
>a woman. This is a court action; neither side will have the slightest  
>amount of science on its side (the studies are just not there), but the  
>court will rule one way or the other. Based upon what? Based upon what  
>courts usually decide upon: who presents the best emotional case.

>  
>By all rights, the case should be thrown out of court for lack of REAL  
>evidence. But the man who lost his wife to cancer has beaucoup  
>emotional points in his favor and the other side has some very deep  
>pockets. It looks like a real legal horserace to me. And, of course, if  
>the court decides against NEC/GTE Mobilnet, then that very case will be  
>used as "evidence" to prove that cellular phones cause cancer.

>  
>>RF tissue heating is mentioned in the various ARRL license manuals.  
>  
>This is about all we know about RF and its effects upon living tissues.

This statement sounds like an "Adairism" if I have ever heard one. You  
are WRONG, my friend.

>Particularly sensitive are the eyes which can develop cataracts. But  
>again, we are talking about many watts from a feedhorn, not a couple of  
>watts from a 450 handheld (with intermittent duty, at that). And I  
>would not lose much sleep over the fixed base unit, either. The  
>inverse/square law has not yet been repealed.

>  
>I swear if I hear about one more thing that "causes cancer"...

>  
>--

> John Higdon | P. O. Box 7648 | +1 408 264 4115 | FAX:  
> john@ati.com | San Jose, CA 95150 | 10288 0 700 FOR-A-M00 | +1 408 264 4407

-----

Date: Thu, 28 Jan 1993 19:19:29 GMT  
From: usc!sdd.hp.com!swrinde!gatech!darwin.sura.net!haven.umd.edu!wam.umd.edu!  
ham@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jan26.152134.5792@newsgate.sps.mot.com>,  
<1993Jan28.011847.19085@adobe.com>, <1993Jan28.165537.28538@news.acns.nwu.edu>  
Subject : Re: Ham Radio Causes Cancer!

What we have here is a real problem - we are afraid that the general public  
will become totally paranoid about radio. The problem is the public is, as  
usual, uneducated about things like radio. So what have we got?

A public that panics whenever it hears that something that is so widely used  
can make you really sick - or even die. Does the general public have any  
idea what a Megahertz is? Or what frequency is? Or what different frequen-  
cies are used for? And of what each frequency range can do to you?

How many people know what's inside a microwave oven, or what the 101 on the

FM radio or 1450 on the AM radio mean? How many people know what frequency channel 6 uses? How many people (besides hams and comm. engineers) care?

The problem is that these devices (TV, Radio, Microwave oven, etc.) are used by millions of people as a part of everyday life, totally unaware of how and why they work the way they do, and how each could potentially injure you if misused.

We hams know that the president of Motorola, upon giving his speech, "Cellular phones are totally safe...", was simply stating in his own way that no CONCLUSIVE evidence pertaining to the safety of 800 MHz RF at a distance of 2 inches from the head has ever been found. Not that some of us don't know better - it's taught in the NOVICE/TECHNICIAN manuals to keep the rubber duck as far from the head as possible, even at 2 meters. I would never use one of those Cell phones, nor would I comfortably use 440 MHz, 1200 MHz, or above without an antenna far, far away from my body. HF is a different story. Limit exposure as much as possible, although the lower energy of HF, compared to VHF/UHF and above, while safer, may still be somewhat dangerous. It's our job to help those who question the safety of RF to set the record straight. Some frequencies are more dangerous than others.

73, hope I didn't offend anyone,

Scott NF3I

-----  
Date: 28 Jan 93 17:56:55 GMT  
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!olivea!inews.Intel.COM!  
sousa.intel.com!jreece@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <C1F8Fp.4wM@inews.Intel.COM>, <44051@zygot.ati.com>,  
<8571@lib.tmc.edu>ntel.co  
Reply-To : jreece@sousa.intel.com  
Subject : Re: Ham Radio Causes Cancer

In article <44051@zygot.ati.com> john@zygot.ati.com (John Higdon) writes:  
>I swear if I hear about one more thing that "causes cancer"...

Of course such stories never balance cancer risks the far more likely risks, such as:

- 1> Having an accident due to the distraction of operating a base/mobile, HT, or cellular phone.
- 2> Outright electric shock.

--

John Reece                    "This lifeboat is full"  
Not an Intel spokesman

-----

Date: Thu, 28 Jan 1993 15:10:14 GMT  
From: agate!spool.mu.edu!uwm.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!miltf@ames.arpa  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jan27.184350.5273@linus.mitre.org>,  
<1k6o7jINN29p@rave.larc.nasa.gov>, <1993Jan28.005729.18634@adobe.com>•  
Subject : Re: Burglars are brighter than you might think!

swirsky@adobe.com (Robert Swirsky) writes:

>>In article <1993Jan27.184350.5273@linus.mitre.org> m14494@mwvm.mitre.org (Mike White) writes:

>>>Fred Lloyd writes:

>>>> Beware of the Eavesdroppers...

>>> I make it a personal practice NEVER to discuss vacation plans over the air

>>> I don't even like to mention the fact that my wife is in the car with me >

>>> (meaning that the house is empty

>>>

>I think you guys are being silly! There are many ways a person can determine  
>if a house is occupied, without listening for hams on the radio.

>While it's probably not a good idea to discuss your vacation plans on the  
>radio, there is absolutely no evidence to link the information  
>revealed in the QSO with the break-in.

One of the reasons the State of Illinois stopped giving car license registration information to anyone who called a police station is that in the Chicago area, burglars were sitting on bridges over interstates noting the license plates of obviously loaded autos heading out of town. They would then call the police and pretend to have some reason to contact that person (like that person's car was bumped in a parking lot, etc.). The burglars would then go to the home and carry off whatever they wanted. I am sure there are other reasons of privacy which also added to the change of policy, but this does show that some burglars are intelligent enough to locate homes of those on vacation.

Add to the list of places to not discuss travel plans: cellular phones! There are many scanners capable of monitoring the cellular band. It is more difficult to get information here because the person monitoring does not have any way

to track the caller unless names and/or addresses are given during the call.

-----

End of Info-Hams Digest V93 #129

\*\*\*\*\*